



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,765	03/10/2004	Petteri Poyhonen	042933/271450	3955
826	7590	01/04/2011	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			GONZALEZ, AMANCIO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/04/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/797,765

Applicant(s)

POYHONEN, PETTERI

Examiner

AMANCIO GONZALEZ

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/29/2010 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The clarifying amendments to the claims have also been considered and found that the scope of the claims remains as previously presented; therefore, Applicant's arguments and the response to said arguments address the amended claims as well as previously presented.

Applicant's arguments raise the following issues:

- (1) that nowhere does Barany disclose that its SIP INVITE is prepared for transmission "in response to receipt of a connection request;"
- (2) that Barany also does not disclose that its SIP INVITE is independent of the network via which a connection request is received, i.e., "network-independent;"
- (3) that Barany does not disclose that its SIP INVITE is prepared for transmission to the terminal from which a registration message is received;
- (4) that Barany does not teach or suggest an apparatus being caused to receive a registration message, in response to the network-independent trigger, via the network to thereby register the terminal with the apparatus and acquire a network-dependent identity of the terminal;
- (5) Barany does not teach or suggest an apparatus being caused to at least prepare a network-independent trigger for transmission to a terminal based upon a network-independent identity of the terminal to thereby trigger the terminal to update its registration with the apparatus;

(6) that nowhere does Barany disclose that the SIP INVITE is independent of the network (alleged GSM) via which the registration message is received, i.e., "network-independent;" and

(7) that Silverman and Adams do not cure the deficiencies of Barany.

Regarding Issue (1), the fact that the SIP proxy receives call requests on behalf of other entities and forwards said call requests to intended destinations (see [0023]) clearly suggests that the SIP INVITE disclosed by Barany is prepared for transmission "in response to receipt of a connection request, as cited.

Regarding Issue (2), according to fig. 5 of the present application, the Examiner understands the network independent trigger as a communication initiation between the SIP proxy and the terminating node or client as the result of forwarding a requested call, which is clearly disclosed by Barany (see [0023] and [0063]).

Regarding Issue (3), if the SIP proxy receives call requests on behalf of other entities and forwards said call requests to intended destinations; that is, connecting an originating communication device, e.g., the call requestor, with a termination device, e.g., the intended call destination, it is evident that the response to the requested call replaces the SIP INVITE sent from the SIP proxy to the destination node or client and is prepared for transmission to the terminal from which a registration message is received.

Regarding Issue (4), it is well known that for establishing communication between at least two telecommunication devices, registration has to take place within the connecting entity, which in this situation is the SIP that receives call requests on behalf

of other entities and forwards said call requests to intended destinations. Barany clearly discloses SIP registration (see [0062]).

Regarding Issue (5), since the SIP proxy receives call requests on behalf of other entities and forwards said call requests to intended destinations (see [0023]), there is no way to communicate with an intended destination without an identity of the destination node or device.

Regarding Issue (6), again, according to fig. 5 of the present application, the Examiner understands the network independent trigger as a communication initiation between the SIP proxy and the terminating node or client as the result of forwarding a requested call, which is clearly disclosed by Barany (see [0023] and [0063]).

Regarding Issue (7), Silverman was cited regarding causing a connection request to be stored/retrieve in/from a buffer; and Adams was cited regarding receiving registration messages from a terminal via at least one of a network address translator (NAT).

As a result, the argued features are written such that they read upon the cited reference(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, 16-21, 23, 25-30, 32-39m 43-48, and 52-54** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barany et al. (US 20020064164 A1), hereafter "Barany."

Consider **claim 1**. Barany discloses:

An apparatus (**CSCF 40 in fig. 1; see [0023]**) comprising:

a processor (**see [0079]**); and

a memory including computer program code, the memory and computer program code configured to, with the processor (**see [0079], [0080]**), cause the apparatus to at least perform the following:

receiving a connection request via a network across which an originating client is configured to communicate (**see fig. 1, [0017], [0023]: the CSCF module 40, within wireless core network 11, is a SIP proxy or server that receives call requests on behalf of other entities, resolves logical addresses or identifiers in the call requests, and forwards the call requests to intended destinations also see Abstract of present application**);

preparing a network-independent trigger for transmission to a terminal in response to receiving the connection request (**see [0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy**); and

receiving a registration message, in response to the trigger, from the terminal via the network to thereby register the terminal with the apparatus and acquire a network-dependent identity (**see [0062]: SIP registration is performed to set up the profile for the mobile station in the CSCF 40, so that the CSCF 40 is aware of the mobile**

station's existence) of the terminal to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the terminal based upon the network-dependent identity of the terminal (**see [0023], [0062]-[0063], fig. 3**).

Consider **claim 2**. Barany teaches claim 1 and further suggests wherein receiving a connection request comprises receiving a connection request from the originating client, and wherein the memory and computer program code are further configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus to further perform preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal after registering the terminal (**see [0023], [0063], fig. 1**).

Consider **claim 3**. Barany teaches claim 2 and further suggests wherein preparing the connection request comprises preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal through at least one other apparatus (**see fig. 1, [0023]: the CSCF module 40 is a (Session Initiation Protocol) SIP proxy or server that receives call requests on behalf of other entities, resolves logical addresses or identifiers in the call requests, and forwards the call requests to intended destinations; see also fig. 3 and [0064]: After all appropriate SIP messages have been exchanged, an RTP bearer path is established (at 114). In the RTP bearer path, IP packets containing RTP payloads are exchanged, hence suggesting transmission to the terminal through at least one other apparatus, the MGW –media gateway**).

Consider **claims 4 and 14**. Barany teaches claims 1 and 10, and further discloses wherein the apparatus is embodied in a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) proxy (**see [0023]**).

Consider **claims 7, 25, and 43**. Barany teaches claims 1, 19, and 37, and further suggests wherein receiving a registration message comprises receiving a subsequent registration message, and wherein the memory and computer program code are further configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus to receive a first registration message from the terminal before preparing the network-independent trigger for transmission to thereby register the terminal with the apparatus, wherein the first registration message includes a network-independent identity of the terminal, and wherein preparing a network-independent trigger comprises preparing a network-independent trigger for transmission based upon the network-independent identity of the terminal (see [0023], [0062]-[0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy).

Consider **claims 8 and 26**. Barany teaches claims 1 and 19, and further suggests wherein preparing the network-independent trigger comprises preparing a network-independent trigger for transmission to the terminal via a network across which an originating client is configured to at least one of directly or indirectly communicate (see figs. 1, 3, [0063]: *trigger* reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy).

Consider **claims 9, 18, and 27**. Barany teaches claims 8, 17, and 26, and further discloses wherein the network comprises at least one of a public network or a private network (see fig. 1, [0003], [0022]).

Consider **claim 10**. Barany discloses:
An apparatus (**CSCF 40 in fig. 1; see [0023]**) comprising:
a processor (**see [0079]**); and

a memory including computer program code, the memory and computer program code configured to, with the processor (**see [0079], [0080]**), cause the apparatus to at least perform the following:

receiving a registration message via a network across which an originating client is configured to communicate, wherein receiving a registration message comprises receiving a registration message from a terminal to thereby register the terminal with the apparatus (**see [0023], [0062]-[0063]**), and wherein the registration message includes a network-independent identity of the terminal (**see [0023], [0063], fig. 1: Providing packet service in circuit-switched cellular networks, e.g., GSM (Global System for Mobile) networks, the General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) technology is used, see [0005], conjunctively with a SIP proxy, which registers the calling and called parties, handling the IP addresses required for packet switched communication; these IP address are independent of the circuit-switched cellular network, on behave of which the CSCF SIP proxy receives and handles those packet-switched call requests**); and

preparing a network-independent trigger for transmission to the terminal based upon the network-independent identity of the terminal to thereby trigger the terminal to update registration of the terminal with the apparatus, including acquisition by the apparatus of a network-dependent identity of the terminal to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the terminal based upon the network-dependent identity of the terminal (**see [0023], [0062]-[0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy**).

Consider **claims 11 and 29**. Barany teaches claims 10 and 28, and further suggests receiving a connection request, the trigger being prepared for transmission in response to receiving the connection request and preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal after acquiring the network-dependent identity of the terminal (see figs. 1 and 3, [0023], [0062]-[0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy; and, before reaching the SIP registration, the mobile sending the call request first goes through a routine network access process, well known in the art to include network identification, which implies acquiring a network-dependent identity of the apparatus to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the apparatus based upon the network-dependent identity of the apparatus).

Consider **claims 12, 21, and 30**. Barany teaches claims 11, 20, and 29, and further suggests wherein preparing the connection request comprises preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal through at least one other apparatus (see figs. 1 and 3, [0023], [0062]-0063]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claims 16, 34, and 52**. Barany teaches claims 10, 28, 46, and further suggests wherein receiving a registration message comprises receiving a first registration message, and wherein the memory and computer program code are further configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus to further receive a subsequent

registration message from the terminal in response to the trigger being sent to the terminal to thereby update registration of the terminal and acquire the network-dependent identity of the terminal, thereby enabling establishment of a communication session with the terminal based upon the network-dependent identity of the terminal (see fig. 1, [0062]: SIP registration is performed to set up the profile for the mobile station in the CSCF 40, so that the CSCF 40 is aware of the mobile station's existence).

Consider **claims 17 and 35**. Barany teaches claims 10 and 28, and further suggests wherein receiving a registration message comprises receiving a registration message via a network across which an originating client is configured to at least one of directly or indirectly communicate (see figs. 1, 3, [0023]).

Claim 19 claims a method performed by the apparatus of claim 1; therefore, the same rejection rationale applies.

Consider **claim 20**. Barany teaches claim 19 and further suggests wherein receiving a connection request comprises receiving a connection request at the apparatus from the originating client, the method further comprising preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal after registering the terminal (see [0023], [0063], fig. 1).

Consider **claim 23**. Barany teaches claim 19 and further suggests wherein preparing a trigger for transmission to the terminal comprises preparing a trigger for transmission to the terminal from an apparatus comprising a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) proxy (see [0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy).

Claim 28 claims a method performed by the apparatus of claim 10; therefore, the same rejection rationale applies.

Consider **claim 32**. Barany teaches claim 28 and further suggests wherein receiving a registration message at an apparatus comprises receiving a registration message at an apparatus comprising a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) proxy (see [0023], [0062]-[0063]).

Consider **claim 36**. Barany teaches claim 28 and further suggests wherein receiving a registration message comprises receiving a registration message apparatus via in a network comprising at least one of a public network or a private network (see fig. 1, [0003], [0022], [0023], [0062]-[0063]).

Consider **claim 37**. Barany discloses:

An apparatus (**CSCF 40 in fig. 1; see [0023]**) comprising:

a processor (**see [0079]**); and

a memory including computer program code, the memory and computer program code configured to, with the processor (**see [0079], [0080]**), cause the apparatus to at least perform the following:

receiving a trigger from another apparatus operating in a network across which an originating client is configured to communicate, the trigger comprising a network-independent trigger (**see [0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy, hence independent from the circuit-switched network**); and

in response to the receiving the trigger, preparing a registration message for transmission to the other apparatus via the network to thereby register the apparatus

with the other apparatus and acquire a network-dependent identity of the apparatus to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the apparatus based upon the network-dependent identity of the apparatus (**see fig. 3, [0023], [0061]-[0063]: before reaching the SIP registration, the mobile sending the call request first goes through a routine network access process, well known in the art to include network identification, which implies acquiring a network-dependent identity of the apparatus to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the apparatus based upon the network-dependent identity of the apparatus).**

Consider **claim 38**. Barany teaches claim 37 and further suggests wherein receiving a trigger comprises receiving a trigger in response to the other apparatus receiving a connection request from the originating client, and wherein the memory stores and computer program code are further configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus to further perform receiving the connection request from the other apparatus after registering the apparatus (see [0023], 0062], [0063]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive a call request, it follows that said call request may come from a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the trigger is sent by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claims 39 and 48**. Barany teaches claims 38 and 47 and further suggests wherein receiving the connection request comprises receiving the connection request from the other apparatus via at least one further apparatus (see fig. 1 and [0023]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive a call request, it follows that

said call request may come from a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the trigger is sent by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 41**. Barany teaches claim 37 and further suggests wherein receiving a trigger comprises receiving a trigger from another apparatus comprising a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) proxy (see [0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy. If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive a call request, it follows that said call request may come from a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the trigger is sent by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 44**. Barany teaches claim 37 and further suggests wherein receiving a trigger comprises receiving a trigger from another apparatus operating in a network across which an originating client is configured to at least one of directly or indirectly communicating (see [0062]-0063): *trigger* reads on INVITE: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 45**. Barany teaches claim 44 and further suggests wherein receiving a trigger comprises receiving a trigger from another apparatus operating in a network comprising at least one of a public network or private network (see fig. 1, [0003], [0022], [0063]: trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy. If the proxy

apparatus of network 11 can receive a call request, it follows that said call request may come from a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the trigger is sent by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 46**. Barany discloses:

An apparatus (**CSCF 40 in fig. 1; see [0023]**) comprising:

a processor (**see [0079]**); and

a memory including computer program code, the memory and computer program code configured to, with the processor (**see [0079], [0080]**), cause the apparatus to at least perform the following:

preparing a registration message for transmission to another apparatus operating in a network across which an originating client is configured to communicate, wherein preparing a registration message comprises preparing a registration message for transmission via the network to thereby register the apparatus with the other apparatus, wherein the registration message includes a network-independent identity of the apparatus (**see [0023], [0063], fig. 1: Providing packet service in circuit-switched cellular networks, e.g., GSM (Global System for Mobile) networks, the General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) technology is used, see [0005], conjunctively with a SIP proxy, which registers the calling and called parties, handling the IP addresses required for packet switched communication; these IP address are independent of the circuit-switched cellular network, on behave of which the CSCF SIP proxy receives and handles those packet-switched call requests**); and

receiving a network-independent trigger based upon the network-independent identity of the apparatus to thereby trigger the apparatus to update registration of the apparatus with the other apparatus, including acquisition of a network-dependent identity of the apparatus to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the apparatus based upon the network-dependent identity of the apparatus (see [0023], [0062]-[0063]: *trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy, hence independent from the circuit-switched network*).

Consider **claim 47**. Barany teaches claim 46 and further suggests wherein receiving a network-independent trigger comprises receiving a network-independent trigger in response to the other apparatus receiving a connection request from the originating client, and wherein the memory and computer program code are further configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus to further perform receiving the connection request from the other apparatus after registering the apparatus with the other apparatus (see [0023], [0062]-[0063]: *trigger reads on INVITE, sent by the SIP proxy, hence independent from the circuit-switched network*. If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 50**. Barany teaches claim 46 and further suggests wherein preparing a registration message comprises preparing a registration message for transmission to another apparatus comprising a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) proxy

(see [0062]-0063]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 53**. Barany teaches claim 46 and further suggests wherein preparing a registration message comprises preparing a registration message for transmission to another apparatus operating in a network across which an originating client is configured to at least one of directly or indirectly communicate (see [0062]-0063]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Consider **claim 54**. Barany teaches claim 46 and further suggests wherein preparing a registration message comprises preparing a registration message for transmission to another apparatus operating in a network comprising at least one of a public network or a private network (see fig. 1, [0003], [0022], [0062]-0063]: If the proxy apparatus of network 11 can receive/transmit a call request, it follows that said call request may be received/transmitted from/to a terminal communicating via another network similar to Network 11 in figure 1, where the call request is sent/received by another proxy similar to CSCF 40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims **5, 13, 22, 31, 40 and 49** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barany et al. (US 20020064164 A1), hereafter "Barany," in view of Silverman et al. (US 20040156380 A1), hereafter "Silverman."

Consider **claims 5, 13, 22, 31, 40 and 49**. Barany teaches claims 1, 11, 20, 29, 38, and 47 and further suggests receiving a connection request and preparing the connection request for transmission to the terminal based upon the network-dependent identity of the terminal (see fig. 3, [0023], [0061]-[0063]: before reaching the SIP registration, the mobile sending the call request first goes through a routine network access process, well known in the art to include network identification, which implies acquiring a network-dependent identity of the apparatus to thereby enable establishment of a communication session with the apparatus based upon the network-

dependent identity of the apparatus), but is silent regarding causing the connection request to be stored/retrieve in/from a buffer. Silverman, in analogous art, suggests the aforesaid limitation about which Barany is silent (see Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Silverman's teachings regarding causing the connection request to be stored/retrieve in/from a buffer in Barany's invention for the purpose of providing users preference in establishing and conducting VoIP calls by: (i) assigning precedence (a classmark) to calls, as discussed by Silverman (see [0012])).

6. Claims **6, 15, 24, 33, 42, and 51** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barany et al. (US 20020064164 A1), hereafter "Barany," in view of Adams et al. (US 20050210292 A1), hereafter "Adams."

Consider **claims 6, 15, 24, 33, 42, and 51**. Barany teaches claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 46; but is silent regarding receiving registration messages from the terminal via at least one of a network address translator (NAT) or a firewall (FW) operating between the apparatus and the terminal, and wherein preparing a network-independent trigger comprises preparing a network- independent trigger for transmission in a manner independent of the at least one of the NAT or FW. However, Adams, in analogous art, suggests the aforesaid limitation (see [0098]). Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Adam's teachings in Barany's invention, thus enabling clients to traverse firewall and NAT installations, as discussed by Adams (see [0003]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Amancio González, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1106. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost, can be reached at (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Nghi H. Ly/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

AG/ag

December 30, 2010